

### **REMARKS**

An extension of time has been submitted along with this response on the same date.

The examiner has rejected claims 1, 2 and 4-8 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Levosky. The Examiner has considered Applicant's previous response and has stated that the limitation of an "identity management system" is overly broad, and has considered the Applicant's response to not be persuasive, stating that the client control program taught in Levosky teaches similar subject matter. Applicant respectfully submits that the term "identity management system" is a term of the art that is not satisfied by the client control program taught in Levosky. Nonetheless, Applicant has amended claim 1, to include reference to the pseudonymous email address generation request containing website identification information and to reference the pseudonymous email address creator storing the website identification information with the associated pseudonymous email address to allow centralized analysis. Applicant's remarks below will indicate why this amendment overcomes the Levosky reference.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8 under 35 USC 101 stating that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner refers to the need to refer to an actual hardware device. Applicant has amended claim 1 to refer to "a processor for executing stored instructions to provide a pseudonymous email address creator...". Applicant submits that this amendment introduces the hardware elements required under 35 USC 101, and is fully supported by the specification as filed, and directs the Examiner's attention to paragraph 65 lines 1-2 for indication of such support. Applicant submits that claims 2-8 all depend on claim 1, and as such include the limitation discussed above. As such, Applicant submits that the claims, as amended, conform with 35 USC 101, and as such requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 7,054,906 to Levosky. Applicant has amended claim 1, so that it recites:

a request interface, for receiving a pseudonymous email address generation request from an identity management system, the request containing website identification information; and

a processor for executing stored instructions to provide a pseudonymous email address creator for creating a pseudonymous email address associated with a mail server in response to the received pseudonymous email address generation request, for associating the pseudonymous email address with an email address, for providing the created pseudonymous email address and its associated email address to the mail server associated with the pseudonymous email address, for providing the created pseudonymous email address to the identity management system and *for storing the website identification information with the associated pseudonymous email address to allow centralized analysis.* (emphasis added)

Applicant directs the Examiner's attention to paragraph [0048] of the application as filed, which at line 2 recites "While prior art systems allow a user to track whom an alias was given to, they require the user to enter the tracking data. In practice, user apathy increases over time and the alias tracking facilities are neglected. Due to its integration with the browser, the plug-in can transmit website identification information to the alias generator which can store the information along with the alias routing information."

Applicant acknowledges that in column 5, at line 55, Levosky teaches that the user can submit information in a "note" field that can later be used to remind the user about where the alias was generated. In particular, Levosky teaches "... the "note", or "message" text previously entered by the user to identify this Alias Email address... appears to remind the user further about this particular Alias Email Address." Applicant notes that Levosky teaches that the user can optionally enter a reminder about the alias email address that can be appended to messages sent to the user. No other use for this information is taught. Applicant notes that the problems associated with this approach are discussed in the background to the application and directs the Examiner's attention to paragraph [0014] of the application as filed.

Applicant notes that in paragraphs [0045] and [0046] of the application as filed, logging of information identifying the entity that the pseudonymous email address is being provided to is discussed. The information is stored at the pseudonymous email address generator as referred to

in paragraph [0046] which teaches, at line 7, "...addresses associated with incoming requests can be stored by alias generator 100 and correlated to monitor alias request activity. Because alias generator 100 can serve a plurality of HTTP servers, alias generator 100 is in a position to determine that a node... is a harvesting application." Applicant notes that the teachings of paragraphs [0045] and [0046] are directed to the embodiment of a webserver requesting alias generation, but submits that the same teachings are applicable to the submission of the website identifying information referred to in paragraph [0048]. As such, the website identifying information can be stored to allow for centralized analysis, which can reveal information not apparent if the analysis is left to users as taught by Levosky.

Applicant submits that Levosky teaches the use of a generic field that is forwarded on to each of the alias servers for embedding into messages forwarded to the user. This is for the purpose of reminding the user where the alias was used. The invention, as claimed in claim 1, centrally stores the website identification information to allow for centralized analysis. Applicant submits that this centralized storage is not taught in the Levosky reference, and that the centralized storage allows for analysis that cannot be provided by the system of the Levosky reference which does not collect the information for each request. Applicant submits that as a result, the invention as claimed in claim 1 is not anticipated by the teachings of Levosky, and requests that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 102(e) be withdrawn.

Applicant notes that claims 2 and 4-8 all depend from claim 1, either directly or indirectly. As such, Applicant notes that claims 2 and 4-8 include all the limitations of claim 1 and as claim 1 is submitted to be novel in view of the Levosky reference, it is submitted that claims 2 and 4-8 are also novel. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection to claims 2 and 4-8 be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claim 3 as being obvious in view of the combination of Levosky and Rounthwaite under 35 USC 103(a). Applicant submits that Levosky does not teach the storage of the website identification information with the associated pseudonymous email address to allow centralized analysis as detailed in the commentary above with respect to claim 1. Applicant further submits that Rounthwaite does not teach this limitation and as such,

Application Serial No. 10/713,100

Amendment Dated: July 28, 2008

Reply to Office Action dated: March 26, 2008

Applicant notes that the combination of Levosky and Rounthwaite, taken together, do not teach the matter claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 3, which depends on claim 1, cannot be taken to be obvious in view of the combination of Rounthwaite and Levosky. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 103(a) be withdrawn.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that the claims presently pending are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the application proceed accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,  
HARDT, Dick C.

By: /Dilip C. Andrade/  
Dilip C. Andrade  
Reg. No. 53,942  
Perley-Robertson Hill & McDougall LLP  
1400-340 Albert Street  
Ottawa ON K1R 0A5  
CANADA  
Tel: (613) 566-2270  
Fax: (613) 238-8775  
Email: dandrade@perlaw.ca